

#20
1/3/02
A.W.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Handel

Application No.: 09/195,852

Filed: November 19, 1998

Title: SHARING A CENTRALIZED PROFILE
(as amended herein)

Attorney Docket #: AND1P030

Examiner: S. Channavajjala

Group Art Unit: 2177

RECEIVED

DEC 31 2001

BOX RCE
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Technology Center 2100

**INFORMATION DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.56**

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.56, § 1.97 and § 1.98, Applicant submits for consideration in the above-identified application the following information.

It is respectfully submitted that this case was recently assigned to the undersigned attorney for continued prosecution. The attorney who originally filed this case, L. Keith Stephens, Registration Number 32,632, is now deceased. At least one Petition to Make Special was filed in this case on December 15, 1999. This Petition to Make Special was based on a careful and thorough search. This Petition to Make Special was filed in this case on the basis that "an infringing device or product is actually on the market and/or an infringing method is actually in use (MPEP 708.02(II)(A))" and that "a rigid comparison of the alleged infringing device, product or method with the claims of the application [was made], and in [the] opinion [of the submitter] some of the claims are unquestionably infringed (MPEP 708.02(II)(B))." Keith Stephens also indicated that he "made a careful and thorough search of the prior art. (MPEP 708.02(II)(C))." The Petition to Make Special based on infringement was granted. The decision

on the Petition to Make Special based on infringement was mailed on January 19, 2001. Due to the death of Mr. Stephens, we are unable to discuss the petition with Mr. Stephens in order to confirm the accuracy of the statements made by Mr. Stephens. Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the Patent Office not rely on any statements made in the previously submitted Petitions. The Patent Office may take whatever action it deems appropriate including withdrawal of this application from Special Status.

Applicant would appreciate the Examiner initialing and signing a copy of this Information Disclosure Statement, transmitted herewith, indicating that the information has been considered and made of record herein.

The information contained in this Information Disclosure Statement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.97 is to the best of my knowledge and is not to be construed as a representation that: (i) a complete search has been made; (ii) additional information material to the examination of this application does not exist; (iii) the information, protocols, results and the like reported by third parties are accurate or enabling; or (iv) the above information constitutes prior art to the subject invention.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 50-1901** referencing **AND1P030**.

Dated: December 20, 2001.

Respectfully submitted,
BOWMAN-AMUAH

By: Steven Lieske

Steven C. Lieske, Reg. No. 47,749
OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY LLP
45 South Seventh Street, Suite 3300
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: 612-607-7508
Fax: 612-607-7100
E-mail: SLieske@oppenheimer.com

PLEASE NOTE

Bennett, Pamela

From: CHilberg@oppenheimer.com
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2003 2:36 PM
To: Pam.Bennett@USPTO.GOV
Cc: Accenture2@oppenheimer.com
Subject: RE: Docket # AND1P030 (60021/303001) (S.N. 09/195,852) (Applicant: Handel et al.)

Ms. Bennet,

Thank you for your correspondence. I have reviewed our file in response to your e-mail, and I have been unable to locate the document you requested. Moreover, the IDS you cited (dated December 20, 2001) was not accompanied by a 1449 and did not disclose references. Rather, that IDS made a statement regarding one of the previous attorneys to work on this application. Therefore, without making any affirmative statements, I am suggesting that it is possible that there is no initialled 1449 in response to the December 20, 2001 IDS because no 1449 was ever submitted on that date.

I would be happy to discuss this matter in more detail or search further if you would like. Please contact me again if you want to continue this conversation. Thanks for your assistance.

Christopher R. Hilberg
Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly LLP
45 S. Seventh Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tel: 612.607.7386
Fax: 612.607.7100